

Reply to Office Action dated May 11, 2006

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1 and 4-5, and 9-11 are amended and claims 13 and 14 are added herein. No new matter is added by these amendments. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 4-6 and 9-14 will be pending in this application.

Objection Under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a)

The amendments filed March 7 and March 23, 2006 were objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) as introducing new matter. The Examiner contends that the material added in the previous amendment is not supported by the original disclosure. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the specification fails to teach that “stereoscopic image display is capable of being established by having each state-selective region selectively transmitting an incident light according to a state of the incident light.”

Applicants traverse the Examiner’s objection and direct the Examiner’s attention to the specification and the figures which clearly support that “stereoscopic image display is capable of being established by having each state-selective region selectively transmitting an incident light according to a state of the incident light.” For example, Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to paragraph 9 of the original application which recites as follows:

In order to achieve this object, a stereoscopic image display apparatus according to one aspect of the present invention includes a display device displaying a plurality of parallax images by different pixels, and an optical separating member in which a plurality of state-selective regions are

Reply to Office Action dated May 11, 2006

lined up, which have properties of selectively transmitting light with different states.

Original Application, at ¶[0009].

Additionally, Applicants further direct the Examiner's attention to numerous figures, including figures 4-10 and 19-24, which illustrate two or more images (101) being projected through a plurality of state selective regions (102), that selectively transmit the incident light according to its state, and directing the light to two or more viewpoints on the viewpoint plane (i.e., wherein each viewpoint corresponds to a persons right or left eye to generate stereoscopic image display).

Applicants believe that the recited claim limitations are disclosed in the specification and figures and respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the objection in view of the foregoing remarks and amendments.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 4-6 and 9-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description and enablement requirements. As to written description, the Examiner contends that the claimed subject matter is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. The Examiner's reasons for the rejection are based on the alleged newly added matter. As discussed above Applicant's believe that the claims are supported by the original disclosure and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection for the same reasons discussed above.

As to enablement, the Examiner contends that the claimed subject matter is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make or use the invention. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the claims and specification fail to teach

Reply to Office Action dated May 11, 2006

how the “stereoscopic display can be established simply by having a plurality of state-selective regions wherein each state-selectively transmitting [*sic*] an incident light according to a state of the incident light.” The Examiner first contends that the claims fail to disclose the coding of this incident light to have the certain states which are selectively transmitted. Second, the Examiner contends that the parallax images must be coded to have orthogonal states. Third, the Examiner contends that the horizontal separating having a plurality of state-selective regions must have state selectivity according to the coding of the light.

Applicants traverse the Examiner’s contentions and believe that the previously submitted claims are enabled because the disclosure teaches how to and/or one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to (1) code incident light to have the certain states which are selectively transmitted, (2) code parallax images to have orthogonal states, and (3) have a plurality of state-selective regions having state selectivity according to the coding of the light, for all of the reasons discussed above with respect to the objections under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a).¹

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Applicants have also amended the claims to more clearly recite the structure and interleaving of the parallax images on the display device. Applicants believe the claims as amended resolve the Examiner’s objections and therefore respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Objections Due To Informalities

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 4-6 and 9-11 because: (1) the phrase “for displaying different parallax images on a viewing region” recited in claims 1 is confusing and

¹ Applicants cannot fully understand the Examiner’s positions due in part to incomplete sentence structure and/or typographical errors (e.g., “stereoscopic display can be established simply by having a plurality of state-selective regions wherein each state-selectively transmitting [*sic*] an incident light according to a state of the incident light” Office Action at p.3, Section 4). To the extent the Examiner does not withdraw this rejection in view of the foregoing arguments and amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clarify the objection so that Applicants can fully respond.

Reply to Office Action dated May 11, 2006

indefinite; (2) the phrase “a vertical separating member projecting light from predetermined pixel ... in the vertical direction” is confusing and indefinite; (3) the phrase “the projection magnification of the vertical separating member in the vertical direction” is confusing and indefinite; (4) the phrase “in a case where first and second ...” in claim 5 is confusing and indefinite; and (5) claims 10-11 fail to teach “what are these different parallax images in order for the stereoscopic images to be displayed.”

Applicants traverse the Examiner’s objections. However, to expedite prosecution of the application, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the Examiner’s objections. Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments resolve the Examiner’s objections and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these objections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of Morishima (USP 5,875,055) in view of Nose et. al (USP 5,991,074).

The Examiner contends that because of the Section 112 issues discussed above, the claims can only be examined given their broadest interpretation. In this context the Examiner contends that Morishima teaches a stereoscopic display apparatus and discloses all of the elements of claim 1 except the use of a vertical separating member for directing light from the pixel of the display to a predetermined position on a horizontal separating member. While the Examiner admits that Morishima does not disclose such a vertical member, the Examiner contends that Nose et. al discloses such a vertical member.

Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejection and believe that the rejection is moot in view of the amendments to the claims made herein which resolve the Section 112 issues and

Reply to Office Action dated May 11, 2006

clarify the unique intermeshing of the parallax images. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the foregoing amendments.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, she is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Reply to Office Action dated May 11, 2006

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. **13-4500**, Order No. 1232-5281. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. **13-4500**, Order No. 1232-5281. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: August 10, 2006By: 

Tod M. Melgar
Registration No. 41,190

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 Telephone
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile